



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,247	01/04/2002	Sang Hyun Yi	262/009	2931

7590 05/09/2003
LEE & STERBA, P. C.
1101 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 2000
Arlington, VA 22209

EXAMINER

WILSON, CHRISTIAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2824

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,247

Applicant(s)

YI ET AL.

Examiner

Christian Wilson

Art Unit

2824

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: search history.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1 – 17 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 18 – 28 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ozawa.

Regarding claim 1, Ozawa (US 4,467,345) discloses a semiconductor device [Figure 4A] comprising a plurality of metal line patterns **8** having a predetermined surface area where two adjacent metal line patterns are spaced apart from each other at a predetermined distance.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Ozawa further discloses that the distance is greater than 1.0 μm and 1.5 μm [column 4, line 25].

Regarding claim 4, Ozawa further discloses that the area is greater than 30 μm by 30 μm [column 4, lines 25-28].

Art Unit: 2824

Regarding claim 5, Ozawa discloses a semiconductor device [Figure 4A] comprising a metal line layer [Figure 4B] with a plurality of metal line patterns 8 spaced apart from each other and an underlying layer 6 under the metal line layer. In response to applicant's claim that the spacing is sufficient to prevent a crack from occurring in the underlying layer, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Since there is no difference between the claimed structure and the device in Ozawa, the claimed intended use does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. Further, Ozawa anticipates the use of the disclosed invention to prevent crack formation [column 2, lines 20-25, 53-55].

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Ozawa further discloses that the distance is greater than 1.0 μm and 1.5 μm [column 4, line 25].

Regarding claim 8, Ozawa further discloses an underlying insulating layer [column 3, line 52].

Regarding claim 9, Ozawa further discloses that the area is greater than 30 μm by 30 μm [column 4, lines 25-28].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2824

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10 – 12 and 14 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Hara *et al.*

Regarding claim 10, Ozawa teaches a semiconductor device [Figure 4A] comprising a plurality of metal line patterns 8 where two adjacent metal line patterns are spaced apart from each other. Hara *et al.* (US 5,229,642) teaches a semiconductor device [Figure 5] where in an adjacent metal line pattern, one pattern has a slit 13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the metal slit of Hara *et al.* with the metal line pattern of Ozawa since the slit reduces the effective width of the line and prevents cracks [column 2, lines 41-45].

Regarding claim 11, Hara *et al.* further teaches a slit with a width greater than 1.0 μm [column 5, lines 1-5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a slit with a width greater than 1.0 μm since this width prevents the increase of the resistance of the metal line.

Regarding claim 12, Hara *et al.* further teaches a slit formed at a predetermined distance from the edge of the metal line pattern [Figure 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the slit at a distance from the edge of the pattern since this reduces the stress in the metal line layer and eliminates cracks [column 5, lines 20-25].

Regarding claim 14, Ozawa teaches a semiconductor device [Figure 4A] comprising a metal line layer [Figure 4B] with a plurality of metal line patterns 8 spaced apart from each other and an underlying layer 6 under the metal line layer. Hara *et al.* teaches a semiconductor device

Art Unit: 2824

[Figure 5] where in an adjacent metal line pattern, one pattern has a slit **13**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the metal slit of Hara *et al.* with the metal line pattern of Ozawa since the slit reduces the effective width of the line and prevents cracks [column 2, lines 41-45].

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Hara *et al.* further teaches a slit parallel to the space between the adjacent metal line patterns with a width greater than 1.0 μm [column 5, lines 1-5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a slit with a width greater than 1.0 μm parallel to the space between the adjacent metal line patterns since this configuration prevents the increase of the resistance of the metal line and eliminates cracks.

7. Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozawa in view of Hara *et al.* as applied to claims 12 and 14 above, and further in view of Matsukawa.

Ozawa as modified by Hara *et al.* teaches the limitations of claims 12 and 14 as described above. Matsukawa (US 4,835,591) teaches a slit in an adjacent metal line pattern which is spaced less than 4 μm from the edge of the metal line pattern [column 4, line 66]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this distance for the metal slit of Hara *et al.* in the device of Ozawa since this distance prevents the formation of hillocks on the metal line [column 4, lines 67-68].

Conclusion

8. A copy of the EAST search history is included in this office action.

Art Unit: 2824

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 308-6265.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays, 7:30 AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Elms can be reached on (703) 308-2816. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0658.

Christian Wilson, Ph.D.
Examiner
Art Unit 2824

CDW
May 6, 2003



Vu A. Le
Primary Examiner